

**REMARKS**

In response to the Final Official Action mailed December 16, 2005, Applicants propose amendment of their application and request reconsideration. In this Amendment After Final, no claims are added and claims 2-6, 8, 12-16, 18, 22-26, and 28 are canceled without prejudice, so that claims 1, 7, 9-11, 17, 19-21, and 27-30 remain pending. No new matter has been added.

Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the subject matter of dependent claims 2-6, which are now canceled. Claim 11 has been amended to incorporate the subject matter of dependent claims 12-16, which are now canceled. Claim 21 has been amended to incorporate the subject matter of dependent claims 22-26, which are now canceled. Claims 7, 9, 10, 17, 19, 20, 27, and 30 are amended for conformity. Applicants respectfully submit that Applicants' amendment does not necessitate further search.

**I. 35 U.S.C. § 102 Anticipation Rejection of Claims**

Claims 1-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by *Beizer* et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,240,414, hereinafter "*Beizer*"). That rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants respectfully submit that *Beizer* does not anticipate amended claim 1. To anticipate a claim, the reference must teach every element of the claim. MPEP § 2131. *Beizer* fails to meet this stringent test. For example, *Beizer* fails to teach that server or client operations are translated back up a conflict list across previous server or client operations. The Examiner contends that *Beizer* teaches these limitations, in reference to now canceled claims 5 and 6, at column 4, lines 27-30 and Figure 4 and its description. However, no portion of *Beizer* says anything of "translating" back up a conflict list across all "previous operations." *Beizer* simply does not support the Examiner's contention. Thus, for at least this reason, *Beizer* fails to anticipate amended claim 1.

*Beizer* further fails to teach that if a translation is “a rename or a reparent of an ancestor of [an] object in the tree, [a] winning operation is translated to refer to the object using its new lineage.” The Examiner asserts “[i]n *Beizer*’s reconciliation process, the winning operation is rename/reparent, and a new lineage is thus applied to the winning file.” Page 5 of the Official Action, in reference to now canceled claims 7 and 8. However, the Examiner provides no support for that assertion. In fact, the Examiner’s assertion is not supported by *Beizer*. *Beizer* teaches nothing similar to that limitation. Applicants note that *Beizer* makes no reference to a rename or reparent of an ancestor, nor does *Beizer* say anything of applying a new lineage. Thus, for at least this reason, *Beizer* fails to anticipate amended claim 1.

Accordingly, *Beizer* fails to anticipate amended claim 1 or its dependent claims. Because amended claims 11 and 21 recite limitations similar to amended claim 1, claims 11 and 21 and their dependent claims are not anticipated by *Beizer* for at least the same reasons.


**II. Conclusion**

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that all claims are allowable over the cited prior art and respectfully request early and favorable notification to that effect.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: March 15, 2006

By:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
A. Wesley Ferrebee  
Registration No. 51,312

Customer No. 58328  
Sonnenschein Nath & Rosenthal LLP  
P.O. Box 061080  
Wacker Drive Station  
Chicago, IL 60606-1080  
Telephone: 202/408-9214  
Facsimile: 312/876-7934